DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 343 191 CS 507 779

AUTHOR Kearney, Patricia; And Others
TITLE What Students Don't Like about What Teachers Say and Do.
PUB DATE Nov 91
NOTE 44p.; Revised version of a paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (77th, Atlanta, GA, October 31-November 3, 1991).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Behavior Problems; *Classroom Communication; *Classroom Environment; Classroom Research; Factor Analysis; Higher Education; *Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance; Student Reaction; *Teacher Behavior; Teacher Characteristics; *Teacher Student Relationship; Undergraduate Students
IDENTIFIERS *Communication Behavior; Communication Patterns

ABSTRACT

To change the way classroom discipline and student discipline are examined, a two-study investigation, rather than focusing on student noncompliance and other types of student misbehaviors, examined teachers themselves as potential sources of instructional and/or motivational problems in the college classroom. The first study was designed to elicit inductively college student reports of teacher misbehaviors. Participants were 254 undergraduates at a large Western university who were enrolled in two sections of a course on interpersonal communication. Responses to an open-ended questionnaire indicated 28 different categories of teacher misbehaviors. The second study was structured to validate the obtained categories of teacher misbehavior types and to determine whether or not a conceptually meaningful factor structure underlies the categories. Even though most students (subjects were 261 undergraduates enrolled in introductory communication classes at a large Western university) reported that the teachers referenced for this study infrequently engaged in each misbehavior type, a representative number of other teachers did. Importantly, the full range of frequencies was obtained across all 28 categories. Results were further collaborated with qualitative data. Factor analyses and factor matching procedures revealed that the teacher misbehavior categories could be both meaningfully and reliably reduced to three factors: teacher incompetence, offensiveness, and indolence. Recommendations include that teachers examine the list of 28 behavior categories in light of their own classroom behaviors. (Four tables of data and 24 references are included.) (SG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Patricia Kearney

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED343191

WHAT STUDENTS DON'T LIKE ABOUT WHAT TEACHERS SAY AND DO

*Patricia Kearney Timothy G. Plax

Ellis R. Hays Marilyn J. Ivey

Running Head: TEACHER MISBEHAVIOR

*Patricia Kearney (Ed.D., West Virginia University, 1979), Timothy G. Plax (Ph.D., University of Southern California, 1974) and Ellis R. Hays (Ph.D., Purdue University, 1967) are Professors and Marilyn J. Ivey (B.A., California State University, Long Beach, 1989) is a graduate student in the Department of Speech Communication at California State University, Long Beach, 1250 Bellflower Blvd., Long Beach, CA 90840-2407 (714-897-5262).

This research was funded, in part, by a Research Assigned Time grant from California State University, Long Beach.

An initial analysis of the data reported in Study 1 should also appear in the M.A. thesis of Marilyn J. Ivey under the direction of Timothy G. Plax.

An earlier version of this paper was presented on the Top 3 research report panel of the Instructional and Developmental Division of the Speech Communication Association, Atlanta, 1991.

CS507779

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

WHAT STUDENTS DON'T LIKE ABOUT WHAT TEACHERS SAY AND DO

Abstract

This investigation represents a substantial change in the way we examine classroom discipline and student resistance. Rather than focusing on student non-compliance and other types of student misbehaviors, we examined teachers themselves as potential sources of instructional and/or motivational problems in the college classroom. Study 1 was designed to elicit inductively, college student reports of teacher misbehaviors. Results indicated 28 different categories of teacher misbehaviors. Study 2 was structured to (1) validate the obtained categories of teacher misbehavior types and (2) to determine whether or not a conceptually meaningful, factor structure underlies the categories. Even though most students reported that the teachers referenced in study 2 infrequently engaged in each misbehavior type, a representative number of other teachers did. Importantly, the full range of frequencies was obtained across all 28 categories. Results were further corroborated with qualitative data. Factor analyses and factor matching procedures revealed that the teacher misbehavior categories could be both meaningfully and reliably reduced to 3 factors: Teacher Incompetence, Offensiveness and Indolence. Implications for managing student resistance in the classroom are discussed.

WHAT STUDENTS DON'T LIKE ABOUT WHAT TEACHERS SAY AND DO

A large body of literature examines students as instigators of a variety of problems for the classroom teacher (see, for instance, Doyle's 1986 review). Students are frequently accused of talking out-of-turn, disrupting teacher talk, not paying attention and a whole host of other classroom misbehaviors. As a result, a great deal of attention has been focused on the causes of student disruptions and the intervention strategies that teachers can employ to handle these misbehaviors. Unfortunately, the research and advice offered in this tradition often overlooks teachers themselves as a potential source of problems in the classroom. Not surprisingly, this oversight might be anticipated from researchers who happen to be teachers as well. In this study, we depart from that tradition by assuming that (1) teachers themselves may "misbehave" and (2) these misbehaviors can become potential sources of student dissatisfaction and resistance.

Conceptually, student misbehaviors are defined as those student behaviors that interfere with learning (c.f., Kearney, Plax, Richmond, & McCroskey, 1984). Similarly, we define teacher misbehaviors as those teacher behaviors that interfere with instruction and thus, learning. Repeatedly letting students out of class early, failing to keep office hours, returning papers late, providing nonspecific evaluations on homework assignments, making the test too hard (or too easy), or delivering humorless,

monotonous lectures all interfere with our ability to teach effectively and thus, can all be classified as teacher misbehaviors (Plax & Kearney, 1990). In this paper, we argue that these and other teacher misbehaviors can influence the way students think and act.

A large body of literature substantiates a relationship between what teachers say and do with students' behaviors. In the tradition of the process/product paradigm, research-based conclusions about those specific teacher behaviors that influence student achievement, feedback, time spent on-task, classroom order, student affect, good work habits, social skills, independence and other outcome variables are reviewed elsewhere (Brophy & Good, 1986; Gage & Needels, 1989; Good & Brophy, 1986; Rosenshine & Stevens, 1986). More recently, research on students' thought processes emphasizes the critical role that students' perceptions of what teachers say and do play in influencing students' motivation, achievement, attitudes and related student reactions. In other words, what teachers do influence students' thinking. That thinking, in turn, mediates student behavior (Wittrock, 1986). Following from this mediational perspective then, we might expect teacher misbehaviors to indirectly affect students behavior by influencing how students think about and act towards the teacher, school and themselves.

Because we know that <u>what</u> teachers say and do can significantly affect <u>how</u> students think and behave, we might

expect teacher misbehaviors to act as potential antecedents to a number of undesirable student consequents. In other words, teacher misbehaviors may be a primary, albeit indirect, determinant of student disruptions. This report describes two studies identifying ways that teachers themselves may contribute to the occurrence of problems in the classroom. Study 1 was structured to elicit inductively, college student reports of teacher misbehaviors. Study 2 was designed to validate the obtained categories of teacher misbehavior types and to determine whether or not a conceptually meaningful factor structure underlies the categories. The research and thinking on classroom management and student resistance provide the rationale for this investigation.

Classroom Management

Within the classroom management perspective the primary responsibility for classroom control and student engagement lies not with the student, but with the teacher. Instead of highlighting student misbehavior problems, this alternative advocates a preventative stance toward discipline. The appeal of classroom management has its roots in a line of research which demonstrates that the single best predictor of learning is simply "academic engagement time" (Woolfolk & McCune-Nicolich, 1984; Woolfolk, 1987). No matter what instructional strategies or methods are used, the teacher who keeps her/his students actively involved in the learning process is more likely to be effective (Woolfolk & McCune-Nicolich, 1984, p. 442).

This fundamental principle has led a number of researchers to identify those teacher behaviors which influence students' time spent on task (Emmer, Evertson, Sanford, Clements, & Worsham, 1984; Evertson, Emmer, Clements, Sanford, & Worsham, 1984). Based on classroom observations of elementary and secondary instruction, Emmer et al. (1984) and Evertson et al. (1984) differentiate effective from ineffective classroom managers. These researchers report that good managers regularly rely on positive questioning techniques and motivational messages (cues and prompts), attend more often to positive than negative student behaviors, provide students with good role models, give frequent and specific feedback, hold students accountable, and plan success-oriented learning experiences. The end result is that effective classroom managers increase students' time spent on task (Brophy & Evertson, 1976; Cantrell, Stenner, & Katzenmeyer, 1977; Emmer et al., 1984; Evertson et al., 1984).

Consistent with the classroom management perspective, instructional communication researchers argue that managing students successfully also requires that we "persuade" our students that learning is important, enjoyable and beneficial to their overall well-being (c.f., Kearney, 1987; Plax & Kearney, 1990). In response to the need to identify those communication strategies which contribute to teacher influence in the classroom, an initial series of seven studies was designed that isolated and validated 22 separate behavior alteration techniques and representative, sample messages for classroom use (c.f.,

Kearney, Plax, Richmond, & McCroskey, 1984, 1985). The results of these and subsequent investigations in the same program of research (c.f., Kearney, Plax, Smith, & Sorensen, 1988; Kearney, Plax, Sorensen, & Smith, 1988) indicate that both teachers and students readily agree on the preferred use of prosocial or reward-oriented, as opposed to antisocial or punishment-based, influence techniques. That is, teachers perceived them to be useful in managing students' behavior and, in turn, students reported that they enjoy the class and learn more content when their teachers rely on prosocial means of influence.

With rare exception the classroom management behaviors and strategies reported in the educational and communication literature are success-oriented or prosocial. The converse or absence of those behaviors would seem to contribute negatively to students' involvement with learning. An overview of recent research on student resistance supports and extends that position.

Student Resistance

Rather than attend solely to what teachers strategically communicate in their efforts to manage or influence students, Burroughs, Kearney and Plax (1989) acknowledged the role of the student in the teacher/student exchange. Experienced teachers recognize that students often fail to concede the teacher's right to assume a power role. Moreover, a number of students may be reluctant or openly defiant, to assume their expected role of conciliation, cooperation and submission. In an effort to

isolate those strategies college students might use to resist teachers' influence or compliance-gaining attempts, Burroughs et al. (1989) asked students to construct messages they would use to resist their teachers in the classroom. Nineteen separate categories of techniques and messages were identified in that research.

In a follow-up study, Kearney, Plax and Burroughs (in press) validated the 19 categories and explicated two theoretically meaningful dimensions underlying the resistance categories: Teacher-Owned and Student-Owned. In explanation, problem-ownership refers to the degree to which the problem apparently originates with the student or the teacher. Kearney et al. (in press) reasoned that students blame two primary sources for their own resistance decisions: Either the teacher "owns" the problem or the student does. Confirming that explanation, the techniques that comprise the Teacher-Owned dimension imply that the teacher is somehow behaving inappropriately or inconsistently with student expectations of what instructors should or should not do. Drawing from the sample messages that represent Teacher-Ownership, students were more likely to resist by accusing the teacher of being "unenthused, boring, unprepared and doesn't seem to care." In other words, we might conclude that the teachers referenced by students in that study had "misbehaved."

In contrast, strategies reflected in the second dimension suggest that students themselves actually <u>own</u> the reasons for their resistance. Students who selected Student-Owned techniques

were likely to justify their resistance by making excuses, claiming to have other priorities, or asserting the right to make their own decisions. Specifically, students might say, "I have homework so I can't prepare well for this class" or "Right or wrong, that's the way I am." These statements and others suggest that students hold themselves, not the teacher, responsible for their resistance decisions.

In that same study Kearney, Plax and Burroughs (in press) found that college students' selections of either Teacher-Owned or Student-Owned resistance were influenced by teacher nonverbal immediacy. When presented with scenarios depicting a warm, approachable, friendly teacher (immediate), students were more likely to select Student-Owned strategies in their resistance attempts. Conversely, when presented with descriptions of a cold, aloof, distant teacher (nonimmediate), students selected Teacher-Owned techniques.

Apparently, judgments of teacher immediacy direct students' subsequent attributions of problem ownership. In turn, these attributions govern students' selections of either Teacher-Owned or Student-Owned resistance techniques. Within the context of this investigation, it is reasonable to assume that while immediate teacher behaviors are appropriate and preferred for the classroom, nonimmediate behaviors would correspond more closely with those teacher <u>mis</u>behaviors that students' perceive as interfering with instruction. Whether or not nonimmediacy can be equated directly with student reports of teacher misbehaviors

remains an empirical question. We do know, however, that students explain or justify their own resistance, at least in part, by what their own teachers do or say (Kearney et al., in press).

In an effort to more fully understand why students resist teachers, this two-study investigation shifted the focus from student-centered reasons to conceiving teachers themselves as potential antecedents to student problems in the classroom. In other words, we were interested in identifying teacher behaviors that students' report being detrimental to instruction and thus, demotivating to them. Pertinent to this change in focus, the first study asked:

RQ1: What do college teachers say and do that students perceive as "misbehaviors?"

Recognizing that teacher misbehaviors are likely to vary widely in frequency of occurrence and type depending on the particular teacher, the second study was designed to validate across a diversity of university teachers, the categories of misbehavior identified in Study 1. Moreover, we assumed that further examination of these data would help to determine whether or not the misbehavior categories isolated in Study 1 could be reduced to a set of conceptually meaningful underlying dimensions. For these reasons, research questions in Study 2 asked:

RQ2: How frequently do students report their college teachers engaging in each misbehavior type?

RQ3: What meaningful factor structure underlies the teacher misbehavior categories?

Study 1

This study was designed to derive empirically both a broad-based and representative classification of teacher classroom behaviors that college students report as misbehaviors. In order to derive such an inductive scheme, the research design was structured to generate as many student descriptions of teacher misbehaviors as possible. These data were used to answer Research Question 1: "What do college teachers say and do that students perceive as 'misbehaviors?'"

METHODS

Subjects. Participants were 254 (110 males, 144 females) undergraduate students enrolled in two large sections of interpersonal communication at a large Western University. Approximately 36% of the sample were freshman, 25% were sophomores, 25% were juniors, and 14% were seniors. The mean age for this sample was 24. This course fulfilled general education requirements across the university and therefore, students represented a diversity of major fields.

Procedures. In order to identify the wide variety of teacher misbehaviors that can occur in college classrooms, an open-ended questionnaire was distributed to the student participants. Instructions on the questionnaire asked participants "to think back over their college career and to recall specific instances where teachers had said or done

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

something that had irritated, demotivated or substantially distracted them in an aversive way during a course." Students were then asked to provide brief written descriptions of as many teacher misbehaviors as they could and to be as specific in their depictions as possible. In order to stimulate students' recall of the illustrations, examples of teacher misbehaviors were included in the questionnaire (i.e., "Not showing up for class," "Making fun of a student," "Using sarcasm to get even with a student," or "Teaching the wrong thing"). Space was provided following the examples for students to write out their descriptions of the various teacher misbehaviors. A total of 1762 brief teacher misbehavior descriptions was generated across the sample. The average number of misbehaviors described per student participant was 6.9.

Results. All 1762 descriptions generated by the students were included in the unitizing, coding, defining and labeling of the teacher misbehavior categories. These activities were completed in seven stages. In stage one, the raw data were unitized into separate and discrete misbehaviors. A unitizer/coder read a sample of the raw units in order to become familiar with the data. In stage two, this same individual read each and every descriptive unit and placed them into categories containing both conceptually and/or operationally similar words and phrases. Units which were the easiest to categorize were sorted first; more difficult units were initially set aside and then sorted into categories at a later time.

In phase three the same coder reread all of the teacher misbehavior units in each of the categories to check for consistency and to make sure that all the units were sorted into their appropriate categories. Tentative labels were given to each separate classification of units and preliminary category definitions were formulated. In phase four, the coder again reread the descriptions in each category and based on the tentative labels and definitions made any necessary adjustments and revisions in the composition of any of the misbehavior categories. In phase five the coder refined and made revisions in the category labels and definitions.

Phases six and seven involved two additional coders. In phase six, the second and third coders were familiarized with the data. In phase seven, both coders re-categorized sample units from each of the categories in an effort to ensure category appropriateness and to determine the degree of coder agreement. Percent of unit-by-unit agreement between the original coder and the two additional coders ranged from 68% to 100% depending on the particular category. Intercoder agreement among all three coders, assessed by unit-by-unit agreement, was .91.

Because of the relatively close agreement across the three coders only slight adjustments needed to be made in finalizing the categories. The resulting inductive classification of teacher misbehaviors was organized into 28 categories. Table 1 presents the categories with sample teacher misbehavior descriptions obtained with this procedure. This table also

presents the rankings of these 28 categories including frequencies and category percentages against the total number of descriptions analyzed in this study. The following section describes conceptually the 28 teacher misbehavior categories.

Insert Table 1 about here

Teacher Misbehavior Categories. Four categories, absent, tardy, keeps students overtime, and early dismissal, categories address the issue of teacher punctuality and absenteeism. Teachers in these categories are depicted as insensitive either to the time demands placed on students or to students' desire to have their time in the classroom be a complete and constructive experience. The 5 categories of strays from subject, confusing/unclear lectures, unprepared/disorganized, deviates from syllabus, and late returning work emphasize teacher organization and structure. These categories portray teachers as who lack focus and pay little or no attention to the instructional process. Sarcasm and putdowns, verbally abusive, unreasonable and arbitrary rules, and sexual harassment are 4 categories that capture teachers' contempt of students. These teachers are characterized as individuals who publicly degrade students, appear unreasonable and highly structured, and are chauvinistic in the classroom. Unresponsive to students' questions, apathetic to students, and inaccessible to students outside of class are 3 categories that speak to teacher indifference. Instructors described in these categories are

unapproachable and impervious to questions, showing little concern for students.

The 2 categories of unfair testing and unfair grading capture teachers who employ unjust methods of evaluation. Teachers represented in these categories are ambiguous testers and inconsistent, temperamental graders. The boring lectures category characterizes those teachers who are unenthusiastic, overly repetitive and much too serious during their classroom presentations. Information overload depicts teachers who are either overly demanding of students or noticeably unreasonable in their instructional demands. Information underload characterizes those teachers who are too easy; those from whom students feel they have learned very little or absolutely nothing. The 2 categories of negative personality and negative physical appearance illustrate teachers who possess negative personal attributes. Teachers described in these categories tend to be moody and self-centered and often dress or act inappropriately in class. The does not know subject matter category illustrates those instructors who are obviously either unqualified to teach the subject matter or simply do not know the course content. Shows favoritism or prejudice characterizes those teachers who show preferences to particular students and who reinforce the concept of stereotypes in the classroom. Foreign or regional accents, inappropriate volume, and bad grammar/spelling are 3 categories which capture teachers' misuse of language. Such teachers are described as unintelligible and/or hard to hear

during lectures and often display poor language skills.

Study 2

This study was designed to validate the categories of teacher misbehavior types obtained in Study 1 and to determine whether or not a conceptually meaningful factor structure underlies the original 28 categories. Quantitative data collected in this second study were employed to answer Research Questions 2 and 3: "How frequently do students report their college teacher engaging in each misbehavior type?" and "What meaningful factor structure underlies the teacher misbehavior categories?" Qualitative data were also collected which assisted in our validation and interpretation of findings.

METHODS

Subjects. Participants were 261 (150 females, 111 males) undergraduate students enrolled in introductory communication classes satisfying general education electives at a large Western university. Approximately 26% of the sample were freshman, 31% sophomores, 28% juniors and 15% seniors. The mean age of the students in this sample was 25.

Research Design. Whereas in Study 1 a research design was employed to maximize students' generation of teacher descriptions across teachers more generally, in this study the design was structured for each student to focus on a particular college teacher. While the former results reflect an accumulation of both numerous and disparate teacher misbehavior types, the design

for Study 2 essentially minimizes the reported diversity and frequency of teacher misbehaviors. That is, as a collective group, teachers may engage in a variety of different misbehavior types; however, we would not expect any individual teacher to exhibit all 28 types. By anchoring each student's perceptions to her/his respective teacher then, the design of this validational study allows for a rigorous assessment of the original 28 categories of misbehaviors.

Procedures. Students were given questionnaires which explained that the instrument included "descriptions of things teachers have been observed doing or saying in some classes" which "college students have previously identified as teacher 'misbehaviors.'" They were also told that this study assessed "how often teachers engage in one or more of those behavior types or a behavior similar to those included in the descriptions." Students were instructed to complete the research instrument with reference to "only the teacher you have in the course you are taking that meets just before this class." This anchoring technique developed originally by Plax, Kearney, Richmond, and McCroskey (1986), maximized the variability in subject matter fields represented and allowed for a broad sample of instructors at the university. In this way, data relating to over 250 different classes/teachers were obtained.

After indicating their gender, age and year in school, students were provided with sets of multiple teacher misbehaviors representing each of the 28 categories derived in Study 1 (see

Table 1 for these descriptions). Category labels were not included on the questionnaire. Students were asked to indicate on a 0-4 scale "how frequently your teacher in that class exhibits the same or similar behaviors" with 0 = Never and 4 = Very Often.

Results. As expected, descriptive statistics revealed that even though most of the teachers sampled in this study never (0) or rarely (1) engaged in the sample misbehavior ($M < 1.1$), a number of others did. Importantly, the full range of student responses (0 to 4) was obtained across all 28 categories. Frequency percentages of those scoring 2 or higher ranged from 3.4% to 29.1% per category. Although some categories are more representative than others, these data provide evidence for the perceived occurrence of all 28 misbehavior types. Table 2 provides the means, standard deviations and frequency percentages for those scores.

Insert Table 2 about here

Table 2 also provides a ranking of the misbehavior categories. Delivering boring lectures, straying from the subject matter, employing unfair testing procedures, presenting lectures which are confusing and unclear, and returning students' work late were the 5 most frequently cited teacher misbehaviors. Correspondingly, inductively-derived data from Study 1 revealed that 3 of those same misbehaviors were ranked in the top 5: Strays from subject, unfair testing, and boring lectures. The

two other misbehaviors ranked high in Study 1 were sarcasm/putdowns and absent from class.

Supplementary Data and Analysis. To assist us in validating the data reported in Table 2, we asked each student ". . . to explain why you think your teacher behaves in the ways you've indicated. There may be a single reason or there may be several reasons for your teacher's behavior. Indicate the reason or reasons you think apply." Students were provided with enough writing space to briefly describe up to three prenumbered reasons for their teacher's behavior. Previous research (Kearney et al., in press) has shown that collecting these types of supplemental responses provide valuable and corroborating information. Such additional information allows for the triangulation of primary and secondary data sets---a powerful method (Morine-Dershimer, 1983) for increasing the overall validity of findings.

Examination of students' reported reasons for their teachers' behavior proved to be revealing. Of the 261 students who participated, 117 indicated reasons why their current teacher misbehaves; 111 described reasons why their current teacher did not misbehave and/or why their teacher was so effective in the classroom; and 33 gave no reasons for either their teacher's misbehavior or effectiveness.

It is particularly interesting that without being directly asked, almost 43% of the students indicated reasons why they felt their teacher was so effective in the classroom. Many of these same students also indicated that they could only say positive

things about the teacher for the course they had before this class. However, they also indicated that they either currently had another teacher who frequently misbehaved or that they had had teachers during their college career who had misbehaved in the variety of ways described on the questionnaire. As for teacher misbehaviors, over one-half of the responses either directly or in a restated form, included many of the actual teacher misbehaviors referenced in the original 28 categories.

Table 3 provides representative samples of the reasons students gave for their particular teacher's misbehavior as well as those given for their teacher's effectiveness in the classroom.

Insert Table 3 about here

To summarize what was illustrated across these data, students who indicated that their teacher misbehaved described reasons that depicted their teacher as unable to relate to students, uncaring, preoccupied with other work, uninformed about course content, fearful about initiating personal relationships with students, outdated, selfish and self-centered, and not being committed to the teaching profession. In short, the reasons given for misbehavior suggest that students were less than satisfied with the way their teachers were behaving. On the other hand, students' explanations for their particular teacher's effectiveness portrayed teachers in quite the opposite direction. That is, the effectiveness of teachers was associated with

attributes like a love for the teaching profession, the ability to establish a rapport with students, a solid knowledge of the subject matter, a sincere concern for students, a high level of professionalism, self confidence about teaching the course, an open and friendly nature, and the ability to create a challenging classroom environment. Effective teachers then, were perceived by students as doing a good job and as doing and saying things correctly in the classroom.

These interview-type data both corroborate and elaborate on our other findings illustrating the validity of the teacher misbehavior categories derived in Study 1. Correspondingly, these data indicate that the majority of the students in this sample either currently or previously had a least one teacher who they perceived as behaving inappropriately. Even the students responding to a teacher they described in very positive ways described reasons which illustrated that the students in this sample were able to make a clear distinction between the effectiveness and ineffectiveness of what their college teachers said and did in the classroom.

Reducing the Structure of the Categories

Next, we determined whether the students' responses to the 28 categories as presented on the questionnaire could be reduced to a meaningful underlying factor structure. An overall default factor analysis (eigenvalue < 1.0) resulted in an initial 7-factor solution. However, factors 1, 2 and 3 accounted for most of the variance (44.7%). Moreover, these first 3 factors were

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

conceptually consistent. Subsequent analysis with 3-factor extractions produced stable factors with all items loading on their respective factor. An examination of the item loadings revealed that 7 items failed to meet a liberal 50/30 criterion. With those items eliminated, our second 3-factor solution increased the variance accounted for to 50.6%. The results of this 3-factor solution are reported in Table 4. Interfactor correlations between Factors 1 and 2 were .25, Factors 1 and 3 = .26 and Factors 2 and 3 = .18. Alpha reliabilities obtained for Factor 1 were .86 (M = 5.70, s.d. = 6.31, range = 0-32), Factor 2 = .80 (M = 2.17, s.d. = 3.51, range = 0-20) and Factor 3 = .80 (M = 3.97, s.d. = 4.04, range = 0-23).

Insert Table 4 about here

Nine items comprised Factor 1: Confusing/unclear lectures, apathetic to students, unfair testing, boring lectures, information overload, does not know subject matter, foreign or regional accents, inappropriate volume, and bad grammar/spelling. This factor was labeled "incompetence." Factor 2, labeled "offensiveness," consisted of 6 misbehavior categories: Sarcasm/putdowns, verbally abusive, unreasonable/arbitrary rules, sexual harassment, negative personality, and shows favoritism/prejudice. Items included in Factor 3, labeled "indolence," included 6 misbehavior types: Absent, tardy, unprepared/disorganized, deviates from syllabus, late returning work, and information underload.

Random Split Sample and Factor Matching Procedures. In order to substantiate the reliability of the 3-factor solution we completed two additional procedures. First, we employed a "random split sample" procedure (Armstrong and Soelberg, 1968) to create two within sample subsets. These randomly chosen subsets, each consisting of 130 student responses, were used to compute separate forced 3-factor extractions. Descriptively, the results of these additional factor analyses were virtually identical to those produced with the entire sample of students. These results are available upon request.

Secondly, we followed up the randomized split sample procedure by computing similarity or concordant coefficients (Nesselroade and Baltes, 1970). This factor matching procedure was computed between the pairs of loadings produced on factors 1, 2, and 3 when the entire sample was included and those loadings produced on factors 1, 2, and 3 with a random split sample. The resulting concordant coefficient for factor 1 between the total and the split sample was .999; for factor 2 this index was .995; and for factor 3, .995. These indices provide strong descriptive support for a claim of factor invariance across each set of paired factor loadings.

Additional Analyses. With the reliability of the 3-factor solution substantiated, we attempted to determine potential effects of student age, gender and year in school on students' reports of teacher misbehavior across the dimensions of teacher incompetence, offensiveness, and indolence. We computed a

regression-type 2 (college students' gender) X 4 (year in school) fixed effects multivariate analysis of covariance including student age as a covariate. The criterion variables were operationalized to include students' summed responses across each of the three dimensions of teacher misbehavior. Results indicated that neither student age (*t*'s of the covariate for each of the three dimensions of teacher misbehavior were < = 1) nor gender and year in school were significant (all complex interactions or main effects *p* > .05; overall power estimates for all simple main effects were above .90). Identical results were obtained when the data were transformed into *z* scores prior to computing the MANCOVA. Computations on the standardized data indicate that the shapes of the distributions of the data reported in Table 2 in no way affected either the results of the MANCOVA or the factor analytic and factor matching procedures. Complete results are available upon request. Based on these findings then, at least for this sample of college students, age, gender and year in school have little influence on students' reports of teacher misbehavior.

DISCUSSION WITH IMPLICATIONS FOR THE CLASSROOM

This study represents a shift from the research tradition which focused on student misbehaviors in the classroom to a new perspective which examines teacher misbehaviors. We began this investigation by assuming that teachers can and do misbehave and that these misbehaviors can become potential sources of student dissatisfaction and resistance. In the first of two studies, we

asked college students to identify teacher misbehaviors they had observed during their college career. Over 1700 misbehaviors were inductively derived and then categorized into 28 different teacher misbehavior types. Clearly, students perceived their college teachers to "misbehave."

Categories of teacher misbehaviors ranged from using bad grammar or misspelled words to sexual harassment and verbal abuse. The most frequently cited misbehavior types were (1) Sarcasm and Putdowns, (2) Absent, (3) Strays from Subject, (4) Unfair Testing and (5) Boring Lectures. Perhaps we have all been guilty of one or more of these misbehaviors and perhaps we have "justified" each and every transgression. Even so, from the students' point of view, teachers who cancel class or make their exams too difficult are "misbehaving."

In our second study we presented another sample of college students with multiple misbehaviors representing each of the 28 categories identified in Study 1. Interested in validating the existence of the misbehavior categories, we asked students to indicate how frequently a teacher they had currently engaged in each misbehavior type. Unlike Study 1 which was designed to maximize the generation of a number of different misbehaviors across teachers more generally, in Study 2 we anchored students' perceptions to specific target teachers. In this way, we were able to assess more realistically the range and frequency of each misbehavior actually occurring in the college classroom.

As expected, most of the students reported that their own

teacher rarely engaged in the diversity of misbehavior types indexed. Gratefully then, it appears that most students find their teachers to "behave" appropriately. Before we become too relieved, however, it is important to note that the full range of frequencies was reported for each and every category. For instance, almost 30% of the students reported that their teachers frequently (occasionally to very often) spoke in monotone and rambled throughout the lectures. One-fourth indicated that their teachers were often late in returning papers and exams, wasted class time with personal stories and opinions, asked trick questions on tests or made the items too ambiguous, talked too fast or lectured over students' heads, and confused students by being unclear or inconsistent in their expectations. Apparently, these and other misbehavior types occur frequently enough for students to notice and for teachers to take pause. Moreover, our analysis of the reasons students' give to explain their teachers' behavior tends to corroborate the validity of the 28 misbehavior categories. Examination of these data also indicate that the majority of students were able to discriminate their particular teacher as either misbehaving or behaving effectively based on the 28 categories.

In an attempt to determine if a meaningful factor structure underlied the 28 categories, we were able to reduce all but 7 categories into 3 interpretable dimensions: (1) Incompetence, (2) Offensiveness and (3) Indolence. The reliability of the three dimensions of teacher misbehavior was affirmed with random

split sample and factor matching procedures. Moreover, additional analyses of the factors indicated that students' age, gender, and year in school do not influence the way students report the misbehavior of their teachers.

Misbehaviors represented by Incompetence reflect the lack of very basic teaching skills. Teachers who assign excessive work and rush through the material "to get it all done" may fail to recognize the importance of incremental methods of instruction. These same teachers may also be accused of making their tests too difficult and, at the same time, be unable or unwilling to help students succeed. Specifically, the misbehaviors included in this factor suggest that Incompetent teachers do not seem to care about either the course or the students themselves, do not know their students' names, will not review for exams and fail to allow for student input during class.

The profile of Incompetence is extended further to those teachers who are unenthused about the material, speak in a monotone, enunciate poorly (or speak with difficult foreign or regional accents), and talk too loudly (or softly). Not only does Incompetence refer to instructional ineptitude, but this factor also implies that students perceive Incompetent teachers as ignorant and confused. In other words, students report that teachers of this type are unable to answer questions in class, provide students with incorrect information when they do, lack currency in their area--and then compound the problem by presenting vague, confusing lectures and contradicting themselves

in front of class. In short, teacher Incompetence reflects a number of teacher misbehaviors that clearly interfere with instructional goals and student learning.

Teacher Offensiveness included a number of misbehaviors that implied teachers could be mean, cruel and ugly. Apparently, offensive teachers humiliate students in front of the class, insult and publicly embarrasses them. Offensive teachers may use profanity, become angry or yell and scream in their efforts to intimidate students. These same teachers are rude, self-centered, moody, and whiners; moreover, they condescend to students by acting superior and arrogant.

If those characteristics and behaviors appear insufficient to label teachers of this type as Offensive, consider also reported misbehaviors of sexual harassment and prejudice. Students identify Offensive teachers as those who are chauvinistic, make sexual remarks and flirt with students. These teachers reportedly play "favorites" with their students and/or act prejudicial toward others. Finally, Offensive teachers appear unreasonable and arbitrary; they refuse to accept late work, punish the whole class for one student's infraction, and present themselves as rigid, inflexible and authoritarian.

The third dimension underlying teacher misbehavior types, Indolence, best exemplifies the profile of the stereotypic, absent-minded college professor. Teachers who are considered Indolent are those who fail to show up for class, are late when they do, and offer poor excuses for their truancy. They might

forget test dates and neglect to collect and grade students' homework. Indolent teachers are late in returning students' papers and exams. Because they are so disorganized, they fall behind in their schedules, change due dates for assignments and are forced to adjust their syllabi. Students further report that indolent teachers "underwhelm" them with information by making their classes and tests too easy. Apparently, with indolent teachers, students do not feel they are learning as much as they should.

Earlier research (Kearney, Plax, & Burroughs, in press) indicated that students blame one of two sources for their own resistance decisions: Teachers or students. The results of this investigation suggest that students may have legitimate cause for those attributions. That is, our findings reveal that teachers themselves "misbehave" in the college classroom. While the degree or frequency of those misbehaviors may vary widely across college teachers, students do, in fact, perceive all 28 different misbehavior types to occur. Whether or not misbehaviors of incompetence, offensiveness and indolence actually are causally antecedent to student resistance or other misbehaviors needs further examination. In this way, future research should examine the interactive nature of teacher and student resistance in the classroom.

IMPLICATIONS FOR THE TEACHER

Our results demonstrate that there are a variety of teacher misbehaviors which are likely to influence and potentially,

stimulate student problems in the classroom. The existence of these misbehaviors was reaffirmed by students' reports of current and previous experiences with teachers. We recommend that teachers examine the list of 28 misbehavior categories in light of their own classroom behaviors. Many of the categories represent misbehaviors instructors do almost unknowingly. In fact, we are all guilty of engaging in one or more of these behaviors from time to time.

The decision to label what we say and do as "misbehaviors" has important instructional consequences. While we may be reluctant or unwilling to view our grading procedures as unfair, our accent as incomprehensible, and our attendance rules as unreasonable, students may disagree. While we may feel justified in changing the syllabus unexpectedly, embarrassing a student who interrupts the class, and returning graded papers and exams late, students may disagree. And when they do, undesirable student responses may result. Such responses can take many forms, including negative teacher evaluations, poor attendance, classroom disruptions, and lower achievement. Recognizing these potential consequences, we need to consider students' perceptions as well as our own in our decisions about what we do and say in the classroom.

REFERENCES

Armstrong, J. S., & Soelberg, P. (1968). On the interpretation of factor analysis. Psychological Bulletin, 70, 361-364.

Brophy, J. E., & Evertson, C. M. (1976). Learning from teaching: A developmental perspective. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Brophy, J. E., & Good, T. L. (1986). Teacher behavior and student achievement. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (3rd Ed.) (pp. 328-375). New York: Macmillan.

Burroughs, N. F., Kearney, P., & Plax, T. G. (1989). Compliance-resistance in the college classroom. Communication Education, 38, 214-229.

Cantrell, R. P., Stenner, A. J., & Katzenmeyer, W. G. (1977). Teacher knowledge, attitudes, and classroom teaching correlates of student achievement. Journal of Educational Psychology, 69, 180-190.

Doyle, W. (1986). Classroom organization and management. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (3rd Ed.) (pp. 392-431). New York: Macmillan.

Emmer, E. T., Evertson, C. M., Sanford, J. P., Clements, B. S., & Worsham, M. E. (1984). Classroom management for secondary teachers. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Evertson, C. M., Emmer, E. T., Clements, B. S., Sanford, J. P., & Worsham, J. E. (1984). Classroom management for elementary teachers. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Gage, N. L., & Needels, M. C. (1989). Process-product research

on teaching: A review of criticisms. The Elementary School Journal, 89, 253-300.

Good, T. L., & Brophy, J. E. (1986). School effects. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (3rd Ed.) (pp. 570-602). New York: Macmillan.

Kearney, P. (1987). Power in the classroom. Journal of Thought, 22, 45-50.

Kearney, P., Plax, T. G., & Burroughs, N. F. (in press). An attributional analysis of college students' resistance decisions. Communication Education.

Kearney, P., Plax, T.G., Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (1984). Power in the classroom IV: Alternatives to discipline. In R. Bostrom (Ed.), Communication yearbook 8 (pp. 724-746). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Kearney, P., Plax, T. G., Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (1985). Power in the classroom III: Teacher communication techniques and messages. Communication Education, 34, 19-28.

Kearney, P., Plax, T. G., Smith, V. R., & Sorensen, G. (1988). Effects of teacher immediacy and strategy type on college student resistance to on-task demands. Communication Education, 37, 54-67.

Kearney, P., Plax, T. G., Sorensen, G., & Smith, V. R. (1988). Experienced and prospective teachers' selections of compliance-gaining messages for "common" student misbehaviors. Communication Education, 37, 150-164.

Morine-Dershimer, G. (1983). Tapping teacher thinking through triangulation of data sets. Austin, TX: The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, University of Texas, Report No. 8014.

Nesselroade, J. R., & Baltes, P. B. (1970). On a dilemma of comparative factor analysis: A study of factor matching based on random data. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 30, 935-948.

Plax, T. G., & Kearney, P. (1990). Classroom management: Structuring the classroom for work. In J. Daly, G. Friedrich, & A. Vangelisti (Eds.), Teaching communication: Theory, research, and methods (pp. 223-236). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Plax, T. G., Kearney, P., McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1986). Power in the classroom VI: Verbal control strategies, nonverbal immediacy and affective learning. Communication Education, 35, 43-55.

Rosenshine, B., & Stevens, R. (1986). Teaching functions. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (3rd Ed.) (pp. 376-391). New York: Macmillan.

Wittrock, M. C. (1986). Students' thought processes. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (3rd Ed.) (pp. 297-314). New York: Macmillan.

Woolfolk, A. E. (1987). Educational psychology (3rd Ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Woolfolk, A. E., & McCune-Nicolich, L. (1984). Educational psychology for teachers (2nd Ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Table 1

Teacher Misbehavior Categories with Sample Descriptions, Frequencies, Percentages of Total, and Rankings

Misbehavior	Frequency	%	Rank
ABSENT	142	8	2
Does not show up for class, cancels class without notification, and/or offers poor excuses for being absent.			
TARDY	93	5	6
Is late for class or tardy.			
KEEPS STUDENTS OVERTIME	90	5	7
Keeps class overtime, talks too long or starts class early before all the students are there.			
EARLY DISMISSAL	22	1	23
Lets class out early, rushes through the material to get done early.			
STRAYS FROM SUBJECT	117	7	3
Uses the class as a forum for her/his personal opinions, goes off on tangents, talks about family and personal life and/or generally wastes class time.			
CONFUSING/UNCLEAR LECTURES	74	4	9
Unclear about what is expected, lectures are confusing and vague, contradicts him/herself, jumps from one subject to another and/or lectures are inconsistent with assigned readings.			

	Teacher Misbehavior		36
UNPREPARED/DISORGANIZED	68	4	12
Is not prepared for class, unorganized, forgets test dates, and/or makes assignments but does not collect them.			
DEVIATES FROM SYLLABUS	35	2	20
Changes due dates for assignments, behind schedule, does not follow the syllabus, changes assignments, and/or assigns books but does not use them.			
LATE RETURNING WORK	21	1	24
Late in returning papers, late in grading and turning back exams, and/or forgets to bring graded papers to class.			
SARCASM AND PUTDOWNS	154	9	1
Is sarcastic and rude, makes fun of and humiliates students, picks on students, and/or insults and embarrasses students.			
VERBALLY ABUSIVE	69	4	11
Uses profanity, is angry and mean, yells and screams, interrupts and/or intimidates students.			
UNREASONABLE AND ARBITRARY RULES	23	1	22
Refuses to accept late work, gives no breaks in 3-hour classes, punishes entire class for one student's misbehavior, and/or is rigid, inflexible and authoritarian.			
SEXUAL HARASSMENT	18	1	25
Makes sexual remarks to students, flirts with them, makes sexual innuendos and/or is chauvinistic.			

UNRESPONSIVE TO STUDENTS' QUESTIONS	76	4	8
Does not encourage students to ask questions, does not answer questions or recognize raised hands, and/or seems "put out" to have to explain or repeat him/herself.			
APATHETIC TO STUDENTS	73	4	10
Doesn't seem to care about the course or show concern for students, does not know the students' names, rejects students' opinions and/or does not allow for class discussion.			
INACCESSIBLE TO STUDENTS OUTSIDE OF CLASS	50	3	17
Does not show up for appointments or scheduled office hours, is hard to contact, will not meet with students outside of office time and/or doesn't make time for students when they need help.			
UNFAIR TESTING	110	6	4
Asks trick questions on tests, exams do not relate to the lectures, tests are too difficult, questions are too ambiguous, and/or teacher does not review for exams.			
UNFAIR GRADING	62	4	13
Grades unfairly, changes grading policy during the semester, does not believe in giving A's, makes mistakes when grading and/or does not have a predetermined grading scale.			
BORING LECTURES	96	5	5
Is not an enthusiastic lecturer, speaks in monotone and rambles, is boring, too much repetition, and/or employs no variety in lectures.			

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INFORMATION OVERLOAD	46	3	18
Talks too fast and rushes through the material, talks over the students' heads, uses obscure terms and/or assigns excessive work.			
INFORMATION UNDERLOAD	45	2	19
The class is too easy, students feel they have not learned anything, and/or tests are too easy.			
NEGATIVE PERSONALITY	57	3	15
Teacher is impatient, self-centered, complains, acts superior and/or is moody.			
NEGATIVE PHYSICAL APPEARANCE	24	1	21
Teacher dresses sloppy, smells bad, clothes are out of style, and cares little about his/her overall appearance.			
DOES NOT KNOW SUBJECT MATTER	62	4	14
Doesn't know the material, unable to answer questions, provides incorrect information, and/or isn't current.			
SHOWS FAVORITISM OR PREJUDICE	52	3	16
Plays favorites with students or acts prejudiced against others, is narrow-minded or close-minded, and/or makes prejudicial remarks.			
FOREIGN OR REGIONAL ACCENTS	16	0.9	26
Teacher is hard to understand, enunciates poorly, and has a strong accent that makes it difficult to understand.			
INAPPROPRIATE VOLUME	9	0.5	27
Doesn't speak loudly enough or speaks too loud.			

			Teacher Misbehavior 39
BAD GRAMMAR/SPELLING	7	0.4	28
Uses bad grammar, writes illegibly, misspells words on the exam (or on the board) and/or generally uses poor English.			
ALL OTHERS NOT CATEGORIZED	50	3	

Table 2

Means, Standard Deviations, Frequency Percentages of Scores 2 or Higher,* and Rankings of Teacher Misbehavior Types

Category	Mean	SD	X	Rank
Absent	.46	.83	10.7	17.5
Tardy	.87	1.09	20.7	8
Keeps students overtime	.79	1.09	18.7	9
Early dismissal	.72	.87	15.0	10
Strays from subject	.98	1.15	27.6	2
Confusing/unclear lectures	.94	1.15	24.6	4
Unprepared/disorganized	.40	.79	6.8	25
Deviates from syllabus	.84	1.10	21.1	7
Late returning work	.87	1.16	23.8	5
Sarcasm and putdowns	.49	.96	11.6	15
Verbally abusive	.26	.75	6.1	26
Unreasonable/arbitrary rules	.39	.89	9.0	21
Sexual harassment	.15	.55	3.4	28
Unresponsive to students' questions	.34	.73	8.0	22.5
Apathetic to students	.45	.91	10.7	17.5
Inaccessible to students	.37	.81	7.7	24
Unfair testing	.93	1.18	27.0	3
Unfair grading	.52	1.01	13.4	11
Boring lectures	1.08	1.34	29.1	1
Information overload	.82	1.11	23.4	6
Information underload	.52	.92	12.2	14
Negative personality	.46	.95	12.7	12.5
Negative physical appearance	.36	.82	8.0	22.5
Does not know subject matter	.25	.60	5.0	27
Shows favoritism or prejudice	.41	.85	9.2	20
Foreign or regional accents	.48	.93	12.7	12.5
Inappropriate volume	.36	.82	7.9	19
Bad grammar/spelling	.40	.87	11.1	16

*Absolute mean = 2.0, with 0 = never and 4 = very often.

TABLE 3

Student Reasons for Teacher Misbehavior

and for Teacher Effectiveness in the Classroom

I. Reasons for Teacher Misbehavior

"She doesn't relate with our culture."

"She is so well educated that she can't relate to students."

"He says that this job is just a stepping stone for him before he gets to teach at a better university."

"He behaves this way to get it across to the students not to F--K with him."

"I think she acts in these ways because as she says: 'I'm not a educator, I'm a mathematician'."

"I think my Religious Studies teacher would be happier writing a book than dictating to our class."

"My teacher doesn't understand what she is trying to teach us."

"In order to make a test more challenging he asks trick questions."

"He is late because he is so busy and puts the class behind his other interests."

"I think my teacher is shy and is afraid to be a real person with us."

"He thinks everyone in his G.E. class is enrolled because it is their major."

"The instructor is mostly into research and chose not to care about students."

"She is mad at the university and takes it out on us."

"Has 'an I don't care if you come to class or not attitude'."

"Because she is a very opinionated feminist."

"As far as his dress is concerned, he feels that has nothing to do with what he is trying to teach."

II. Reasons for Teacher Effectiveness

"My teacher likes what he is teaching."

"He sincerely likes students and loves to express himself clearly."

"She likes teaching and enjoys the rapport she has with her students."

"She really cares about the information being delivered to the class."

"He does keep us over sometimes, but that's only because he gets so excited about the material."

"She's a great teacher. I think it is because she has her masters in communication. She knows how to be an effective instructor."

"Because he's fair and truthful to students."

"He definitely has the desire for making each student understand the material."

"He's always prepared and explains the subject well."

"Because she teaches what is useful."

"He is very open, warm, and kind to every student in the class regardless of sex or race."

"She loves her job and it shows."

"He really encourages discussion and takes student's opinions as valid and equal to his own."

"He is a powerful speaker. From the first day of class I told myself I'd like to be like him."

"My teacher is challenging but I like her that way. She wants us to learn what she knows."

---

*These examples illustrate reoccurring themes. More complete lists are available upon request.

Table 4

Factor Analysis of Teacher Misbehavior Types.

MISBEHAVIOR	INCOMPETENCE	OFFENSIVENESS	INDOLENCE
Absent	.05	-.01	.60
Tardy	.09	.02	.62
Confusing/Unclear lectures	.68	.08	.39
Unprepared/Disorganized	.37	.08	.73
Deviates from syllabus	.09	.15	.70
Late returning work	.23	.29	.75
Sarcasm and putdowns	.11	.82	.05
Verbally abusive	.04	.79	.07
Unreasonable/arbitrary rules	.16	.62	.02
Sexual harassment	-.10	.52	.15
Apathetic to students	.61	.31	.10
Unfair testing	.68	.11	.07
Boring lectures	.69	-.01	.19
Information overload	.73	.17	.17
Information underload	.03	.02	.54
Negative personality	.43	.63	.19
Does not know subject matter	.57	.03	.19
Shows favoritism/prejudice	.27	.64	.01
Foreign/regional accents	.70	.02	.00
Inappropriate volume	.70	.17	-.06
Bad grammar/spelling	.70	.09	.11
Eigenvalues	6.22	2.27	2.13
Variance	29.60	10.80	10.10
Alpha Reliabilities	.86	.80	.80